DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 120 233 80 TM 005 192

AUTHOR Skiffington, Eugene W.
TITLE Impact Study--Cooperative Accountability Project: An Investigation of Users' Reactions to the Printed CAP Materials and the Regional Educational Accountability Conferences on Techniques (REACT).
INSTITUTION Colorado State Dept. of Education, Denver. Cooperative Accountability Project.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Sep 75
NOTE 73p.; Occasional light print

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Conferences; Data Analysis; *Educational Accountability; Evaluation; Program Effectiveness; *Publications; *Surveys; *Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS Cooperative Accountability Project

ABSTRACT

Pennsylvania, one of the cooperating states in the Cooperative Accountability Project (CAP), was commissioned to complete an Impact Study which would provide a measure of interest, reaction, and benefits as described by readers of CAP publications and participants in CAP conferences or other activities. In part I of the study, evaluation forms were sent to 1,400 persons to determine the usefulness of CAP documents, the concerns which stimulated interest, and any inadequacies which the recipients felt existed in any of the publications which they had read. Survey replies were punched on cards for computer analysis. The data is presented for each publication separately; there were 270 replies to the survey. The second study obtained reactions in narrative form, via telephone survey, to the Regional Educational Accountability Conferences on Techniques (REACT) and the printed CAP materials. Interview tapes were transcribed word for word and are included in the document. The two survey forms are appended. (RC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

TM

ED120233

IMPACT STUDY

COOPERATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY PROJECT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TM005 192

PROJECT OPERATIONS BOARD

CAP is guided by a Project Operations Board consisting of the chief state school officers of the cooperating states or their designees.

COLORADO Calvin M. Frazier, Commissioner;* and Edwin E. Steinbrecher, Assistant Commissioner, Department of Education

FLORIDA Ralph D. Turlington, Commissioner; and Crane Walker, Administrator, Educational Accountability, Department of Education

MARYLAND James A. Sensenbaugh, State Superintendent; and Pascal D. Forgione, Jr., Administrator, Maryland Accountability Program, Department of Education

MICHIGAN John W. Porter, Superintendent of Public Instruction; and C. Philip Kearney, Associate Superintendent, Department of Education

MINNESOTA Howard B. Casmey, Commissioner; and John W. Adams, Director, State Educational Assessment, Department of Education

PENNSYLVANIA John C. Pittenger, Secretary; and J. Robert Coldiron, Chief, Division of Educational Quality Assessment, Department of Education

WISCONSIN Barbara S. Thompson, State Superintendent; and Archie A. Buchmiller, Assistant State Superintendent, Department of Public Instruction

* Calvin M. Frazier, Chairman, CAP Project Operations Board

The Project Operations Board meets quarterly for Project development.

Project Staff
Arthur R. Olson, Director

U.S. Office of Education
Dexter A. Magers, CAP Coordinator

CAP is a seven-state project initiated in April, 1972, and financed by funds provided under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-10, Title V, Section 505, as amended) with Colorado as the administering state.

Cooperating states are: Florida, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin.

(The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.)

COOPERATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY PROJECT (CAP)

IMPACT STUDY

An investigation of users' reactions to the printed CAP materials and the Regional Educational Accountability Conferences on Techniques (REACT)

Eugene W. Skiffington
Assessment Specialist
Pennsylvania Department of Education

September, 1975

COMMENTS FROM CAP

Unlike commercial publishers or businesses which are dependent upon consumer response, a federally funded program such as the Cooperative Accountability Project (CAP) has no built-in mechanism for market analysis which will reveal the success of its many products and activities.

It is, nonetheless, essential that a project dedicated to the philosophy of accountability be accountable itself. Therefore our cooperating state, Pennsylvania, was commissioned to complete a CAP Impact Study which would provide a measure of interest, reaction, and benefits as described by readers of CAP publications and participants in CAP conferences or other activities.

Responses to the survey were informal, candid, and varied; they comprised both an indication of the value of CAP efforts to date and directions for future undertakings in the area of educational accountability. The CAP Project Operations Board feels this analysis is a vital element of the total Project intent and a somewhat unique approach to evaluation of a federally supported program.

We are most grateful to Eugene W. Skiffington and the other individuals who assisted him in the conscientious work involved in this CAP Impact Study.

Arthur R. Olson, Director
Cooperative Accountability Project
1362 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Grateful acknowledgment is hereby extended to Dr. J. Robert Coldiron and Dr. Richard L. Kohr who designed the survey forms and to Dr. Joyce Kim who assisted in the data analysis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Impact Study I. 1

Conclusions from Impact Study I 3
Data Analysis 4
Comments on CAP Products. 20

Impact Study II 24

What is Your Position in the Accountability Process? 25

What Generated Your Interest in the REACT Topics?. 28

How Did the REACT Conference and/or Publications Affect Your Approach to Accountability 31

Were the Influences of CAP and REACT Transmissible to Others?. 40

What Are Your Unmet Accountability Needs? How Might They Be Met?. 43

What Other Kinds of Accountability Materials Would You Like to See?. 50

Should CAP Materials Remain in Print? 54

Other Comments. 56

APPENDIX I The Two Survey Forms. 58

APPENDIX II Impact Study II Flyers. 64

IMPACT STUDY I

The objectives of this first Cooperative Accountability Project (CAP) Impact Study were to survey the recipients of CAP documents to determine the usefulness of the documents, the concerns which stimulated interest in them, and any inadequacies which the recipients felt existed in any of the publications which they had read.

The large number of CAP publications inhibited the sampling and survey techniques. It was felt that not everyone could respond for every publication without the survey form becoming extremely burdensome. Two forms were devised, each with the first three publications listed in common, (Characteristics of and Proposed Models for State Accountability Legislation, Developing a Large Scale Assessment Program, and Roles of the Participants in Educational Accountability), and each with its own set of six other publications (See Appendix I, Form A and B). The first three publications were chosen to be included on both forms because it seemed that they are the most general in content and have had the widest audiences. Other than the differences in the choice of the six additional publications and color of the paper, both survey forms were identical. Each respondent was asked to evaluate those publications he/she had received by means of check marks in areas which he/she felt applied, or to select numerical response on two continua of use and usefulness.

Seven hundred copies of each form were sent to a random selection of half of the addresses on the State Educational Accountability Repository (SEAR) mailing list. Only 270 of the total 1,400 persons queried actually responded (144 on Form A, 196 on Form B). This response was far below expectations. The large majority of respondents were educators at the state and national level of planning and decision making.

The data received in survey replies were punched on cards and submitted to computer analyses. Each publication was examined separately. All computations were made only for those respondents who had received the publication, and items three through nine were computed only for those respondents who had both received and read the publications in question to some extent.

Within these restrictions a problem with the data became evident. There was a certain percentage of those surveyed who chose not to respond at all in one survey category or another. It was surmised that some respondents felt unable to evaluate a publication on the grounds that the criteria or category was outside their area of interest. For instance, a school superintendent might not feel qualified to judge legislative concerns. This nonresponse also may be partly explained as inadequacy of the survey instrument to cover the complete range of concerns under each category. This further reduced the number of responses for each item category. For these reasons, the percentages

will not equal 100 for a given item since computations are based on the number of respondents who reportedly read the publication.

For instance, publication "A" on page 5 was received by 197 of the respondents. Only 187 of them answered question 2, Amount Read. Of these, ten had not read the publication at all. Therefore, items three through nine reflect only 177 respondents.

For item seven, General Information, only 145 responses were received. This is 82% of 177. This category totals 83% due to rounding error.

The data summary sheets which follow contain tabulations for each publication surveyed and can best be understood after the survey form has been carefully read. References at the top of each page refer to the publication by letter and form; e.g., Publication F-B refers to State Goals for Elementary and Secondary Education which is F on Form B.

The survey form also contained space for comments, and many respondents used it. A representative sample of these comments follows the data analyses.

Conclusions From Impact Study I

In general, the survey disclosed that the CAP publications listed were extensively read by the respondents and shared with others. Although few requested additional copies, the surveyed publications were at least skimmed by 88% and shared by 72% of the respondents. Further, all but one of the publications assisted to a great degree the decision-making activities of the respondents. The percentage of positive responses to this category ranged from 22% to 48%.

The survey revealed that CAP publications usually were requested by the respondents for purposes of general information on the subject of accountability, and the recipients were not disappointed. Responses showed 72% of those surveyed considered the publications somewhat useful or very useful for purposes of general information.

Other reasons for considering each publication to be of value should be considered in light of the publication's intent. All publications were found to be useful in this context.

The respondents' comments were selected on the basis of their representativeness. All the comments seem to indicate that, in general, the CAP publications:

A. Were appreciated by those who are advanced in the field of accountability as well as those involved in some of the earlier stages of accountability

B. Answered the needs of some local school district personnel, but had wider appeal for and were most useful to state-level decision makers

C. Were found by some to lack brevity and conciseness

D. Were felt to be much needed on a continued basis where periodic updating would provide necessary communication of current happenings in accountability

E. Were generally thought to be of significance and lasting value

DATA ANALYSIS

The following data are arrayed in the same order as the original survey forms which were mailed to the respondents. The reader should become familiar with the originals (Appendix A) before attempting to read or interpret the data.

Publication A

1. PUBLICATION TITLE Characteristics of and Proposed Models for State Accountability Legislation

OF 270 REPLIES, 197 (73 %) HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION

ALL THE FOLLOWING DATA WERE COMPUTED FOR THOSE WHO HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION. ITEMS 3 THRU 9 WERE COMPUTED ONLY FOR THOSE WHO HAD AT LEAST SKIMMED IT.

	2. AMOUNT READ				3.	4.	5.	6.
	DETAIL	PORTIONS	SKIMMED	NONE	SHARED	REQUESTED MORE	ASSISTED DECISIONS	MOST USEFUL
FREQUENCY	43	67	67	10	125	14	51	49
PER CENT	22	34	34	5	71	8	29	28

7. DEGREE OF VALUE: (1) VERY USEFUL (2) SOMEWHAT USEFUL (3) VERY LITTLE USE

	GENERAL INFORMATION			PLANNING ASSESSMENT			DEVELOPING LEGISLATION		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	77	56	12	21	38	30	29	21	34
PER CENT	44	32	7	12	21	17	16	12	19

	DEVELOPING GOALS			DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION			IDENTIFYING ACCOUNTABILITY RESOURCES		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	16	34	40	5	27	49	31	28	35
PER CENT	9	19	23	3	15	28	18	16	20

8. REASONS WHY CAP PUBLICATIONS NOT USEFUL:

	VERY LITTLE NEW INFORMATION	NOT RELEVANT	PUBLICATION TOO LONG	INSUFFICIENT GENERAL INFORMATION
FREQUENCY	13	33	6	6
PER CENT	7	19	3	3

9. REASONS FOR REQUESTING CAP PUBLICATION:

	GENERAL INFORMATION	PLANNING ASSESSMENT	DEVELOPING ACCOUNTABILITY LEGISLATION	DEVELOPING EDUCATIONAL GOALS	DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION
FREQUENCY	136	41	26	33	22
PER CENT	77	23	15	19	12

Publication B

1. PUBLICATION TITLE Developing a Large Scale Assessment Program

OF 270 REPLIES, 196 (73 %) HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION

ALL THE FOLLOWING DATA WERE COMPUTED FOR THOSE WHO HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION. ITEMS 3 THRU 9 WERE COMPUTED ONLY FOR THOSE WHO HAD AT LEAST SKIMMED IT.

	2. AMOUNT READ				3.	4.	5.	6.
	DETAIL	PORTIONS	SKIMMED	NONE	SHARED	REQUESTED MORE	ASSISTED DECISIONS	MOST USEFUL
FREQUENCY	54	65	60	60	133	22	73	78
PER CENT	28	33	31	31	74	12	41	44

7. DEGREE OF VALUE: (1) VERY USEFUL (2) SOMEWHAT USEFUL (3) VERY LITTLE USE

	GENERAL INFORMATION			PLANNING ASSESSMENT			DEVELOPING LEGISLATION		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	75	56	9	61	40	16	9	23	44
PER CENT	42	31	5	34	22	9	5	13	25

	DEVELOPING GOALS			DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION			IDENTIFYING ACCOUNTABILITY RESOURCES		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	24	38	33	11	43	36	16	39	36
PER CENT	13	21	18	6	24	20	9	22	20

8. REASONS WHY CAP PUBLICATIONS NOT USEFUL:

	VERY LITTLE NEW INFORMATION	NOT RELEVANT	PUBLICATION TOO LONG	INSUFFICIENT GENERAL INFORMATION
FREQUENCY	10	27	10	9
PER CENT	6	15	6	5

9. REASONS FOR REQUESTING CAP PUBLICATION:

	GENERAL INFORMATION	PLANNING ASSESSMENT	DEVELOPING ACCOUNTABILITY LEGISLATION	DEVELOPING EDUCATIONAL GOALS	DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION
FREQUENCY	133	64	17	41	24
PER CENT	74	36	9	23	13

Publication C

1. PUBLICATION TITLE Roles of Participants in Educational Accountability

OF 270 REPLIES, 199 (74%) HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION

ALL THE FOLLOWING DATA WERE COMPUTED FOR THOSE WHO HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION. ITEMS 3 THRU 9 WERE COMPUTED ONLY FOR THOSE WHO HAD AT LEAST SKIMMED IT.

	2. AMOUNT READ				3.	4.	5.	6.
	DETAIL	PORTIONS	SKIMMED	NONE	SHARED	REQUESTED MORE	ASSISTED DECISIONS	MOST USEFUL
FREQUENCY	38	49	82	20	121	14	62	39
PER CENT	19	25	41	10	72	8	37	23

7. DEGREE OF VALUE: (1) VERY USEFUL (2) SOMEWHAT USEFUL (3) VERY LITTLE USE

	GENERAL INFORMATION			PLANNING ASSESSMENT			DEVELOPING LEGISLATION		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	63	56	19	17	37	33	10	21	42
PER CENT	37	33	11	10	22	20	6	12	25

	DEVELOPING GOALS			DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION			IDENTIFYING ACCOUNTABILITY RESOURCES		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	21	27	36	12	31	40	30	27	31
PER CENT	12	16	21	7	18	24	18	16	18

8. REASONS WHY CAP PUBLICATIONS NOT USEFUL:

	VERY LITTLE NEW INFORMATION	NOT RELEVANT	PUBLICATION TOO LONG	INSUFFICIENT GENERAL INFORMATION
FREQUENCY	13	28	11	6
PER CENT	8	17	7	4

9. REASONS FOR REQUESTING CAP PUBLICATION:

	GENERAL INFORMATION	PLANNING ASSESSMENT	DEVELOPING ACCOUNTABILITY LEGISLATION	DEVELOPING EDUCATIONAL GOALS	DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION
FREQUENCY	133	36	16	37	23
PER CENT	79	21	9	22	14

Publication D-A

1. PUBLICATION TITLE Annotated Bibliography of the State Educational Accountability Repository

OF 126 REPLIES, 101 (80 %) HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION

ALL THE FOLLOWING DATA WERE COMPUTED FOR THOSE WHO HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION. ITEMS 3 THRU 9 WERE COMPUTED ONLY FOR THOSE WHO HAD AT LEAST SKIMMED IT.

2. AMOUNT READ

	DETAIL	PORTIONS	SKIMMED	NONE
FREQUENCY	12	17	55	11
PER CENT	12	17	55	11

3. SHARED	4. REQUESTED MORE	5. ASSISTED DECISIONS	6. MOST USEFUL
59	6	12	15
70	7	14	18

7. DEGREE OF VALUE: (1) VERY USEFUL (2) SOMEWHAT USEFUL (3) VERY LITTLE USE

GENERAL INFORMATION

	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	29	32	8
PER CENT	35	38	10

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

1	2	3
6	17	16
7	20	19

DEVELOPING LEGISLATION

1	2	3
6	10	18
7	12	21

DEVELOPING GOALS

	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	8	19	17
PER CENT	10	23	20

DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION

1	2	3
2	15	19
2	18	23

IDENTIFYING ACCOUNTABILITY RESOURCES

1	2	3
24	17	9
29	20	11

8. REASONS WHY CAP PUBLICATIONS NOT USEFUL:

	VERY LITTLE NEW INFORMATION	NOT RELEVANT	PUBLICATION TOO LONG	INSUFFICIENT GENERAL INFORMATION
FREQUENCY	5	12	3	2
PER CENT	6	14	4	2

9. REASONS FOR REQUESTING CAP PUBLICATION:

	GENERAL INFORMATION	PLANNING ASSESSMENT	DEVELOPING ACCOUNTABILITY LEGISLATION	DEVELOPING EDUCATIONAL GOALS	DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION
FREQUENCY	71	13	5	13	7
PER CENT	85	15	6	15	8

Publication D-5

1. PUBLICATION TITLE Legislation by the States: Accountability and Assessment in Education

OF 144 REPLIES, 131 (91 %) HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION

ALL THE FOLLOWING DATA WERE COMPUTED FOR THOSE WHO HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION. ITEMS 3 THRU 9 WERE COMPUTED ONLY FOR THOSE WHO HAD AT LEAST SKIMMED IT.

	2. AMOUNT READ				3.	4.	5.	6.
	DETAIL	PORTIONS	SKIMMED	NONE	SHARED	REQUESTED MORE	ASSISTED DECISIONS	MOST USEFUL
FREQUENCY	21	57	42	4	88	9	47	52
PER CENT	16	44	32	3	73	8	39	43

7. DEGREE OF VALUE: (1) VERY USEFUL (2) SOMEWHAT USEFUL (3) VERY LITTLE USE

	GENERAL INFORMATION			PLANNING ASSESSMENT			DEVELOPING LEGISLATION		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	52	38	9	7	26	32	14	17	31
PER CENT	43	32	8	6	22	27	12	14	26

	DEVELOPING GOALS			DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION			IDENTIFYING ACCOUNTABILITY RESOURCES		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	6	28	33	5	15	44	19	21	28
PER CENT	5	23	28	4	13	37	16	18	23

8. REASONS WHY CAP PUBLICATIONS NOT USEFUL:

	VERY LITTLE NEW INFORMATION	NOT RELEVANT	PUBLICATION TOO LONG	INSUFFICIENT GENERAL INFORMATION
FREQUENCY	3	16	5	4
PER CENT	2	13	4	3

9. REASONS FOR REQUESTING CAP PUBLICATION:

	GENERAL INFORMATION	PLANNING ASSESSMENT	DEVELOPING ACCOUNTABILITY LEGISLATION	DEVELOPING EDUCATIONAL GOALS	DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION
FREQUENCY	85	27	24	24	15
PER CENT	71	23	20	20	13

Publication E-A

1. PUBLICATION TITLE: Predictors of Achievement: A Bibliography

OF 126 REPLIES, 78 (62%) HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION

ALL THE FOLLOWING DATA WERE COMPUTED FOR THOSE WHO HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION. ITEMS 3 THRU 9 WERE COMPUTED ONLY FOR THOSE WHO HAD AT LEAST SKIMMED IT.

	2. AMOUNT READ				3.	4.	5.	6.
	DETAIL	PORTIONS	SKIMMED	NONE	SHARED	REQUESTED MORE	ASSISTED DECISIONS	MOST USEFUL
FREQUENCY	11	14	38	10	49	5	18	12
PER CENT	14	18	49	13	78	8	29	19

7. DEGREE OF VALUE: (1) VERY USEFUL (2) SOMEWHAT USEFUL (3) VERY LITTLE USE

	GENERAL INFORMATION			PLANNING ASSESSMENT			DEVELOPING LEGISLATION		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	21	24	5	10	15	9	4	10	15
PER CENT	33	38	8	16	24	14	6	16	24

	DEVELOPING GOALS			DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION			IDENTIFYING ACCOUNTABILITY RESOURCES		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	6	14	14	4	10	12	9	15	10
PER CENT	10	22	22	6	16	19	14	24	16

8. REASONS WHY CAP PUBLICATIONS NOT USEFUL:

	VERY LITTLE NEW INFORMATION	NOT RELEVANT	PUBLICATION TOO LONG	INSUFFICIENT GENERAL INFORMATION
FREQUENCY	6	10	0	2
PER CENT	10	16	0	3

9. REASONS FOR REQUESTING CAP PUBLICATION:

	GENERAL INFORMATION	PLANNING ASSESSMENT	DEVELOPING ACCOUNTABILITY LEGISLATION	DEVELOPING EDUCATIONAL GOALS	DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION
FREQUENCY	52	20	4	14	5
PER CENT	83	32	6	22	8

Publication E-B

1. PUBLICATION TITLE Costs of Educational Accountability: A Maryland Exploratory Study

OF 144 REPLIES, 118 (82 %) HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION

ALL THE FOLLOWING DATA WERE COMPUTED FOR THOSE WHO HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION. ITEMS 3 THRU 9 WERE COMPUTED ONLY FOR THOSE WHO HAD AT LEAST SKIMMED IT.

	2. AMOUNT READ				3.	4.	5.	6.
	DETAIL	PORTIONS	SKIMMED	NONE	SHARED	REQUESTED MORE	ASSISTED DECISIONS	MOST USEFUL
FREQUENCY	16	43	40	14	64	2	22	14
PER CENT	14	36	34	12	65	2	22	14

7. DEGREE OF VALUE: (1) VERY USEFUL (2) SOMEWHAT USEFUL (3) VERY LITTLE USE

	GENERAL INFORMATION			PLANNING ASSESSMENT			DEVELOPING LEGISLATION		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	31	30	12	7	17	23	4	9	26
PER CENT	31	30	12	7	17	23	4	9	26

	DEVELOPING GOALS			DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION			IDENTIFYING ACCOUNTABILITY RESOJRCES		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	11	18	24	8	14	28	10	19	21
PER CENT	11	18	24	8	14	28	10	19	21

8. REASONS WHY CAP PUBLICATIONS NOT USEFUL:

	VERY LITTLE NEW INFORMATION	NOT RELEVANT	PUBLICATION TOO LONG	INSUFFICIENT GENERAL INFORMATION
FREQUENCY	4	17	7	5
PER CENT	4	17	7	5

9. REASONS FOR REQUESTING CAP PUBLICATION:

	GENERAL INFORMATION	PLANNING ASSESSMENT	DEVELOPING ACCOUNTABILITY LEGISLATION	DEVELOPING EDUCATIONAL GOALS	DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION
FREQUENCY	75	25	14	27	15
PER CENT	76	25	14	27	15

Publication F-A

1. PUBLICATION TITLE A Dissemination System for State Accountability Programs

OF 126 REPLIES, 73 (58 %) HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION

ALL THE FOLLOWING DATA WERE COMPUTED FOR THOSE WHO HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION. ITEMS 3 THRU 9 WERE COMPUTED ONLY FOR THOSE WHO HAD AT LEAST SKIMMED IT.

	2. AMOUNT READ				3.	4.	5.	6.
	DETAIL	PORTIONS	SKIMMED	NONE	SHARED	REQUESTED MORE	ASSISTED DECISIONS	MOST USEFUL
FREQUENCY	15	13	35	6	41	7	18	14
PER CENT	21	18	48	8	65	11	29	22

7. DEGREE OF VALUE: (1) VERY USEFUL (2) SOMEWHAT USEFUL (3) VERY LITTLE USE

	GENERAL INFORMATION			PLANNING ASSESSMENT			DEVELOPING LEGISLATION		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	19	23	7	5	18	10	3	15	11
PER CENT	30	37	11	8	29	16	5	24	17

	DEVELOPING GOALS			DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION			IDENTIFYING ACCOUNTABILITY RESOURCES		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	5	13	14	17	15	5	6	18	10
PER CENT	8	21	22	27	24	8	10	29	16

8. REASONS WHY CAP PUBLICATIONS NOT USEFUL:

	VERY LITTLE NEW INFORMATION	NOT RELEVANT	PUBLICATION TOO LONG	INSUFFICIENT GENERAL INFORMATION
FREQUENCY	3	10	0	2
PER CENT	5	16	0	3

9. REASONS FOR REQUESTING CAP PUBLICATION:

	GENERAL INFORMATION	PLANNING ASSESSMENT	DEVELOPING ACCOUNTABILITY LEGISLATION	DEVELOPING EDUCATIONAL GOALS	DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION
FREQUENCY	46	11	4	9	16
PER CENT	73	17	6	14	25

Publication F-B

1. PUBLICATION TITLE State Goals for Elementary and Secondary Education

OF 144 REPLIES, 92 (64%) HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION

ALL THE FOLLOWING DATA WERE COMPUTED FOR THOSE WHO HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION. ITEMS 3 THRU 9 WERE COMPUTED ONLY FOR THOSE WHO HAD AT LEAST SKIMMED IT.

	2. AMOUNT READ				3.	4.	5.	6.
	DETAIL	PORTIONS	SKIMMED	NONE	SHARED	REQUESTED MORE	ASSISTED DECISIONS	MOST USEFUL
FREQUENCY	15	34	30	8	57	4	30	22
PER CENT	16	37	33	9	72	5	38	28

7. DEGREE OF VALUE: (1) VERY USEFUL (2) SOMEWHAT USEFUL (3) VERY LITTLE USE

	GENERAL INFORMATION			PLANNING ASSESSMENT			DEVELOPING LEGISLATION		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	26	25	11	8	11	20	3	4	25
PER CENT	33	32	14	10	14	28	4	5	32

	DEVELOPING GOALS			DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION			IDENTIFYING ACCOUNTABILITY RESOURCES		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	19	17	16	5	13	26	6	15	19
PER CENT	24	22	20	6	16	33	8	19	24

8. REASONS WHY CAP PUBLICATIONS NOT USEFUL:

	VERY LITTLE NEW INFORMATION	NOT RELEVANT	PUBLICATION TOO LONG	INSUFFICIENT GENERAL INFORMATION
FREQUENCY	6	13	3	4
PER CENT	8	16	4	5

9. REASONS FOR REQUESTING CAP PUBLICATION:

	GENERAL INFORMATION	PLANNING ASSESSMENT	DEVELOPING ACCOUNTABILITY LEGISLATION	DEVELOPING EDUCATIONAL GOALS	DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION
FREQUENCY	52	18	8	23	12
PER CENT	66	23	10	29	15

Publication G-A

1. PUBLICATION TITLE Using Educational Indicators for Program Accountability

OF 126 REPLIES, 98 (78%) HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION

ALL THE FOLLOWING DATA WERE COMPUTED FOR THOSE WHO HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION. ITEMS 3 THRU 9 WERE COMPUTED ONLY FOR THOSE WHO HAD AT LEAST SKIMMED IT.

	2. AMOUNT READ				3.	4.	5.	6.
	DETAIL	PORTIONS	SKIMMED	NONE	SHARED	REQUESTED MORE	ASSISTED DECISIONS	MOST USEFUL
FREQUENCY	22	27	36	7	62	9	34	34
PER CENT	22	28	37	7	73	11	40	40

7. DEGREE OF VALUE: (1) VERY USEFUL (2) SOMEWHAT USEFUL (3) VERY LITTLE USE

	GENERAL INFORMATION			PLANNING ASSESSMENT			DEVELOPING LEGISLATION		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	36	29	6	15	23	9	6	15	19
PER CENT	42	34	7	18	27	11	7	18	22

	DEVELOPING GOALS			DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION			IDENTIFYING ACCOUNTABILITY RESOURCES		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	16	19	13	7	15	13	13	17	13
PER CENT	19	22	15	8	18	15	15	20	15

8. REASONS WHY CAP PUBLICATIONS NOT USEFUL:

	VERY LITTLE NEW INFORMATION	NOT RELEVANT	PUBLICATION TOO LONG	INSUFFICIENT GENERAL INFORMATION
FREQUENCY	6	10	2	3
PER CENT	7	12	2	4

9. REASONS FOR REQUESTING CAP PUBLICATION:

	GENERAL INFORMATION	PLANNING ASSESSMENT	DEVELOPING ACCOUNTABILITY LEGISLATION	DEVELOPING EDUCATIONAL GOALS	DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION
FREQUENCY	63	25	7	19	14
PER CENT	74	29	8	22	16

Publication G-B

1. PUBLICATION TITLE Accountability: A Bibliography

OF 144 REPLIES, 113 (79 %) HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION

ALL THE FOLLOWING DATA WERE COMPUTED FOR THOSE WHO HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION. ITEMS 3 THRU 9 WERE COMPUTED ONLY FOR THOSE WHO HAD AT LEAST SKIMMED IT.

	2. AMOUNT READ				3.	4.	5.	6.
	DETAIL	PORTIONS	SKIMMED	NONE	SHARED	REQUESTED MORE	ASSISTED DECISIONS	MOST USEFUL
FREQUENCY	17	28	48	12	71	4	25	26
PER CENT	15	25	43	11	76	4	27	28

7. DEGREE OF VALUE: (1) VERY USEFUL (2) SOMEWHAT USEFUL (3) VERY LITTLE USE

	GENERAL INFORMATION			PLANNING ASSESSMENT			DEVELOPING LEGISLATION		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	39	30	9	9	17	22	3	8	28
PER CENT	42	32	10	10	18	24	3	9	30

	DEVELOPING GOALS			DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION			IDENTIFYING ACCOUNTABILITY RESOURCES		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	9	14	27	6	12	31	27	15	16
PER CENT	10	15	29	6	13	33	29	16	17

8. REASONS WHY CAP PUBLICATIONS NOT USEFUL:

	VERY LITTLE NEW INFORMATION	NOT RELEVANT	PUBLICATION TOO LONG	INSUFFICIENT GENERAL INFORMATION
FREQUENCY	5	13	3	3
PER CENT	5	14	3	3

9. REASONS FOR REQUESTING CAP PUBLICATION:

	GENERAL INFORMATION	PLANNING ASSESSMENT	DEVELOPING ACCOUNTABILITY LEGISLATION	DEVELOPING EDUCATIONAL GOALS	DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION
FREQUENCY	67	20	12	23	13
PER CENT	72	22	13	25	14

Publication H-A

1. PUBLICATION TITLE Education in Focus: A Collection of State Goals for Elementary and Secondary Education

OF 126 REPLIES, 75 (60 %) HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION

ALL THE FOLLOWING DATA WERE COMPUTED FOR THOSE WHO HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION. ITEMS 3 THRU 9 WERE COMPUTED ONLY FOR THOSE WHO HAD AT LEAST SKIMMED IT.

2. AMOUNT READ

	DETAIL	PORTIONS	SKIMMED	NONE
FREQUENCY	15	22	30	5
PER CENT	20	29	40	7

3. SHARED	4. REQUESTED MORE	5. ASSISTED DECISIONS	6. MOST USEFUL
49	12	24	24
73	18	48	36

7. DEGREE OF VALUE: (1) VERY USEFUL (2) SOMEWHAT USEFUL (3) VERY LITTLE USE

GENERAL INFORMATION

	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	26	24	3
PER CENT	39	36	4

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

1	2	3
10	18	3
15	27	4

DEVELOPING LEGISLATION

1	2	3
6	11	10
9	16	15

DEVELOPING GOALS

	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	30	14	4
PER CENT	45	21	6

DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION

1	2	3
5	14	9
7	21	13

IDENTIFYING ACCOUNTABILITY RESOURCES

1	2	3
7	13	12
10	19	18

8. REASONS WHY CAP PUBLICATIONS NOT USEFUL:

	VERY LITTLE NEW INFORMATION	NOT RELEVANT	PUBLICATION TOO LONG	INSUFFICIENT GENERAL INFORMATION
FREQUENCY	5	5	2	1
PER CENT	7	7	3	1

9. REASONS FOR REQUESTING CAP PUBLICATION:

	GENERAL INFORMATION	PLANNING ASSESSMENT	DEVELOPING ACCOUNTABILITY LEGISLATION	DEVELOPING EDUCATIONAL GOALS	DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION
FREQUENCY	50	19	5	25	5
PER CENT	75	28	7	37	7

Publication H-E

1. PUBLICATION TITLE Keeping the Public Informed: Accent on Accountability

OF 144 REPLIES, 94 (65%) HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION

ALL THE FOLLOWING DATA WERE COMPUTED FOR THOSE WHO HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION. ITEMS 3 THRU 9 WERE COMPUTED ONLY FOR THOSE WHO HAD AT LEAST SKIMMED IT.

	2. AMOUNT READ				3.	4.	5.	6.
	DETAIL	PORTIONS	SKIMMED	NONE	SHARED	REQUESTED MORE	ASSISTED DECISIONS	MOST USEFUL
FREQUENCY	20	34	26	9	57	5	26	25
PER CENT	21	36	28	10	71	6	33	31

7. DEGREE OF VALUE: (1) VERY USEFUL (2) SOMEWHAT USEFUL (3) VERY LITTLE USE

	GENERAL INFORMATION			PLANNING ASSESSMENT			DEVELOPING LEGISLATION		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	31	22	7	7	12	18	2	2	24
PER CENT	39	28	9	9	15	23	3	3	30

	DEVELOPING GOALS			DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION			IDENTIFYING ACCOUNTABILITY RESOURCES		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	5	10	23	19	10	14	3	16	20
PER CENT	6	13	29	24	13	13	4	20	25

8. REASONS WHY CAP PUBLICATIONS NOT USEFUL:

	VERY LITTLE NEW INFORMATION	NOT RELEVANT	PUBLICATION TOO LONG	INSUFFICIENT GENERAL INFORMATION
FREQUENCY	3	7	3	4
PER CENT	4	9	4	5

9. REASONS FOR REQUESTING CAP PUBLICATION:

	GENERAL INFORMATION	PLANNING ASSESSMENT	DEVELOPING ACCOUNTABILITY LEGISLATION	DEVELOPING EDUCATIONAL GOALS	DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION
FREQUENCY	55	18	8	14	18
PER CENT	69	23	10	18	23

Publication I-A

1. PUBLICATION TITLE Who's Afraid of Educational Accountability?

OF 126 REPLIES, 49 (39 %) HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION

ALL THE FOLLOWING DATA WERE COMPUTED FOR THOSE WHO HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION. ITEMS 3 THRU 9 WERE COMPUTED ONLY FOR THOSE WHO HAD AT LEAST SKIMMED IT.

	2. AMOUNT READ				3.	4.	5.	6.
	DETAIL	PORTIONS	SKIMMED	NONE	SHARED	REQUESTED MORE	ASSISTED DECISIONS	MOST USEFUL
FREQUENCY	14	3	18	10	27	3	8	5
PER CENT	29	6	37	20	77	9	23	14

7. DEGREE OF VALUE: (1) VERY USEFUL (2) SOMEWHAT USEFUL (3) VERY LITTLE USE

	GENERAL INFORMATION			PLANNING ASSESSMENT			DEVELOPING LEGISLATION		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	13	15	5	1	8	9	2	7	10
PER CENT	37	45	14	3	23	26	6	20	29

	DEVELOPING GOALS			DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION			IDENTIFYING ACCOUNTABILITY RESOURCES		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	4	6	9	0	6	11	7	6	8
PER CENT	11	17	26	0	17	31	20	17	23

8. REASONS WHY CAP PUBLICATIONS NOT USEFUL:

	VERY LITTLE NEW INFORMATION	NOT RELEVANT	PUBLICATION TOO LONG	INSUFFICIENT GENERAL INFORMATION
FREQUENCY	2	5	1	1
PER CENT	6	14	3	3

9. REASONS FOR REQUESTING CAP PUBLICATION:

	GENERAL INFORMATION	PLANNING ASSESSMENT	DEVELOPING ACCOUNTABILITY LEGISLATION	DEVELOPING EDUCATIONAL GOALS	DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION
FREQUENCY	32	7	4	7	4
PER CENT	91	20	11	26	11

Publication I-B

1. PUBLICATION TITLE Indicators and Statewide Assessment

OF 144 REPLIES, 102 (71%) HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION

ALL THE FOLLOWING DATA WERE COMPUTED FOR THOSE WHO HAD RECEIVED THE PUBLICATION. ITEMS 3 THRU 9 WERE COMPUTED ONLY FOR THOSE WHO HAD AT LEAST SKIMMED IT.

	2. AMOUNT READ				3.	4.	5.	6.
	DETAIL	PORTIONS	SKIMMED	NONE	SHARED	REQUESTED MORE	ASSISTED DECISIONS	MOST USEFUL
FREQUENCY	21	37	32	7	61	8	32	23
PER CENT	21	36	31	7	68	9	36	26

7. DEGREE OF VALUE: (1) VERY USEFUL (2) SOMEWHAT USEFUL (3) VERY LITTLE USE

	GENERAL INFORMATION			PLANNING ASSESSMENT			DEVELOPING LEGISLATION		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	36	31	9	20	13	20	2	9	29
PER CENT	40	34	10	22	14	22	2	10	32

	DEVELOPING GOALS			DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION			IDENTIFYING ACCOUNTABILITY RESOURCES		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
FREQUENCY	11	13	29	6	11	33	14	17	21
PER CENT	12	14	31	7	12	37	16	19	23

8. REASONS WHY CAP PUBLICATIONS NOT USEFUL:

	VERY LITTLE NEW INFORMATION	NOT RELEVANT	PUBLICATION TOO LONG	INSUFFICIENT GENERAL INFORMATION
FREQUENCY	5	15	5	3
PER CENT	6	17	6	3

9. REASONS FOR REQUESTING CAP PUBLICATION:

	GENERAL INFORMATION	PLANNING ASSESSMENT	DEVELOPING ACCOUNTABILITY LEGISLATION	DEVELOPING EDUCATIONAL GOALS	DEVELOPING DISSEMINATION
FREQUENCY	60	24	11	21	14
PER CENT	67	27	12	23	16

COMMENTS ON CAP PRODUCTS

COMMENTS Noted by Survey Respondents

- CAP publications provide a clearinghouse of information that would otherwise be difficult to assemble due to staff limitations.

- Felt publications were rather simplistic and elementary, but perhaps need to be for state of the art is in early infancy. All made contribution by adding to available literature.

- The CAP was an invaluable resource to me, our research group and several individuals in the field.

- In providing staff services for the education committees of the legislature, it is necessary to maintain general knowledge about what is developing in the field of accountability. As legislative committees deal with specific aspects of accountability, these publications will have very direct application and use.

- Your publications are of great value. They begin with a bias. You need an advisory as well - gadfly - devil's advocate - to keep you more objective. The Bettinghaus publication was by far the most unbiased and useful to me. Keep up the good work, but call together a few of us skeptics to help you keep your efforts in balance.

- Excellent Project - worth every dollar spent since accountability will have major impact in future! Recommend additional input from economic theory such as T. Schultz on education as a human instrument. Also suggest CAP publications be included (All!) in ERIC System.

- I am finding the publications useful in helping to build my own concept of accountability.

- The collection is particularly used by members of the education committees of the House and Senate.

- I have found the CAP publications useful and have very much appreciated receiving them. Any <u>low marks</u> in my responses are only to indicate relative importance to me in my particular role. For example, I am concerned with administering an accountability program within a local district, not formulating legislation for a state or creating a dissemination system.

- The publications are useful as references - have utility in preparing speeches, writing reports, and staff discussions...also in teaching graduate education courses. Most have not been used to generate or initiate our accountability program because we already have one.

COMMENTS (continued)

- I think a great service could be done to all levels of elementary and secondary education in the United States if CAP could proceed in a more pragmatic, useful direction...in addition to being the clearing-house for local and state programs.

- I found these had little narrative content and not much that I could really use. I did not request the publications. They were useful in that they pointed out how many approaches there are and how dangerous it is to draw conclusions on early evidence.

- Generally excellent materials, usually the indepth (sic) data is most helpful to me. Timeliness a factor.

- In rendering technical assistance to school districts, the CAP publications provide an excellent print resource to have on hand for rationale bases in program development.

- I expect these materials to become of increasingly greater value in the near future and look forward to receiving more of same. Please retain my name on an active mailing list.

- My responses will underestimate the value of the publications by a wide margin for I already had a very strong background in accountability.

- Need more material for local level as compared to statewide.

- They provide information as to what is being done elsewhere, allow comparisons of projects, and provide excellent sources of information.

- The nature of planning, evaluation, and research activities make the publications a valuable tool.

- I've received a number of additional reports which were excluded from your survey but failed to receive some which you have listed. The information is generally useful to instruction and student research in graduate courses. Possibly, some local accountability workshops for state department and local district employees may be arranged.

- Such reports are essential if we are to build on the experiences of others.

- Publications are very good ones that can be used by LEA and SEA administrators and legislators.

COMMENTS (continued)

- Would be helpful: Short publications (position papers, technical reports, etc.) on specific topics - e.g., statistical techniques, sampling plans, philosophical considerations (for example, Does statewide accountability tend to reduce individualization of education?), conflicts between aims of education (for example, Does accountability increase the difficulty of humanizing education?).

- As an editor, I can guarantee you all of these could have been half as long without sacrificing important information.

- CAP has been a great help in all areas of the area of accountability programs.

- It is my feeling that the CAP funding was money well spent and that the project should be continued. I would be pleased to write a separate letter in this regard. The subject of accountability interested me from a slightly different perspective than that indicated in the above questions. It has been my opinion that unless professional educators account well for their stewardship themselves, it can be done poorly from without.

- At my ASCD special session at New Orleans, I disseminated fifty copies of three CAP publications - Legislation by States, Roles of Participants and Keeping the Public Informed - among other materials on the subject I had gathered. The CAP booklets were well received by superintendents, principals, directors, professors of education and others. For others at the session who wanted them (beyond the 50 I had) I gave your Colorado address.

  Indeed I found myself without a single copy of the valuable Legislation by States and would appreciate receiving a couple of copies for my own usage. This booklet should be updated yearly - as well as others by a continuing CAP.

  Although I have never met him, I would adjudge Dr. Arthur Olson to be a very special person. Every effort should be made to retain him as head of the CAP Project.

- I like these publications to keep me informed of the state of the art. If they were a bit more concise and brief, I would find them more useful.

IMPACT STUDY II

The purpose of this second phase of the Impact Study was to obtain reactions in narrative form to the REACT Conferences and the printed CAP materials. Several methods were considered, such as taped face-to-face interviews, sending tapes and questions by mail, and taped telephone interviews. Tapes were thought to be necessary, as many details might be lost if only notes were taken.

The taped telephone interview was the method selected because it was cheaper and more flexible than the face-to-face interview, and it allowed for the interviewer to develop the respondents' reactions by drawing them out on the various interview themes and helping the respondents to summarize and stick to the point. In addition, the original questions could be refined and more pointedly expressed as the interviewer gained experience.

The sample of respondents was selected randomly from the lists of those attending the REACT Conferences in Denver and Tampa. When the sample had been selected, those in the sample were mailed a form letter explaining the study, showing the questions that were to be used, and requesting those cooperating to return a coupon with their phone numbers and the times they would be available for phone interviews (see Appendix II). The sample consisted of 40 conferees at the SEA level, 20 at LEA level, and 20 at the intermediate unit or interim level. Of 19 replies, one interview was destroyed by equipment failure, and one turned out to be a REACT evaluator who had been working for CAP. One response was from someone who had not attended the conference. The latter interview is included because of the respondent's familiarity with CAP materials. A sample of 17 interviews was thought to be too small, so ten more conferees were called. The method of selection of these last 10 conferees was based on the fact that the CAP materials and conferences were aimed primarily at SEA's, but few SEA's had responded to the random sample method of selection. Accordingly, the last 10 interviews were entirely made up of SEA conferees from as many different states as possible. The total sample consisted of 14 conferees from SEA's, 7 from LEA's, and 6 from intermediate units.

The interview tapes were transcribed word for word, except where syntax errors left the meaning unclear or where dialogue took place not directly related to the Impact Study. Every effort was made to preserve the flavor and intent of the respondent's answers. The interviewer attempted to clarify the question for the respondent when an answer was thought to be vague, which occasionally led the topic somewhat far afield. For some questions the respondent rambled, or had no comment. No responses were transcribed for those questions.

The transcriptions which follow are numbered so that the reader may follow one respondent through the interview, as well as read all the responses to any one question.

What is Your Position in the Accountability Process?

1. I monitor state accountability programs for the state teachers' organization and serve on a pilot project for an NEA accountability effort.

2. I am the chairman of a consortium of several school districts included in a joint accountability effort and am serving as a resource program chairman in our school district.

3. I am deputy superintendent of a school district with major responsibility in the areas of curriculum and instruction.

4. I am coordinator of a statewide accountability project.

5. I will be coordinating the accountability functions for our state.

6. I am project director for a private nonprofit citizens' committee. We have been funded for one year to produce three publications on what is accountability, models of accountability throughout the U.S., and a model for our large, eastern city school system.

7. I am a principal of an elementary school which is involved in a pilot study for our statewide accountability model.

8. I am a consultant for a large nonprofit educational agency.

9. I am a consultant in the Office of Planning and Needs Assessment for our State Department of Education.

10. I am chairman of the accountability council for our school district.

11. I am a parent and member of a school district School Improvement Process Council. It's the accountability committee with a longer name.

12. I am the assistant to the superintendent for Educational Performance and Accountability (for a large, eastern city).

13. I am a superintendent of schools for a large, northwestern city and chairman of the state advisory committee on assessment. We are also involved in a statewide accountability project.

14. I am deputy associate state superintendent, and we have a solid commitment to accountability.

15. I am coordinator for educational assessment programs for a large, commercial education research firm.

What is Your Position in the Accountability Process? (continued)

16. I am a teacher in a school which is part of a six-district consortium on accountability developed by our State Department of Education.

17. I am the assistant superintendent for research, evaluation, and planning. I am the chief accountability officer, as I view all of these activities as accountability, if you define accountability as public disclosure and the justification of current procedure. I am basically a statistician and a research methodologist.

18. I am Title I Evaluator for the State Department of Education. I have served on our statewide assessment committee for a number of years.

19. I am the administrative officer for accountability for my state.

20. I'm head of the office of Planning and Research. We, in our office, do not implement programs. All we can do as a consequence of assessment and other data that we might collect is point out apparent needs in the educational enterprise and point out that these are some of the things that people should work on at the state, regional, or the local level. We do have the dissemination component. It's a responding kind of effort where people identify needs and the kind of program they want to work on. We try to research the literature, the files, and research and come out with some type of program to help them.

21. I'm the evaluation specialist for the general education section of the state. I have worked and will continue to work on the statewide needs assessment plan.

22. I am a program administrator for the State Department of Education. The state has a comprehensive, systematic planning requirement, and most districts are now either in, or just past, a needs assessment phase. A fair portion of our time is involved with helping them in that requirement.

23. I am director of accountability for our state as deputy superintendent.

24. I'm the director of Program Evaluation and Research, and one of the activities that we have worked with rather closely is the design for assessment in the state and for local district accountability. We have worked with the legislature in this arena and with the state advisory committee. We have been deeply immersed in this.

25. I work as a consultant with eight school districts. I have no authority with any of these school districts. I simply provide counsel by making recommendations on programs. I guess I belong to what would be called an intermediate unit in some states.

What is Your Position in the Accountability Process? (continued)

26. We have been involved in research and development activities, planning for the comprehensive restructuring of our state system of student finance. It has been a two-year activity since July 1973. We went through the legislative process with a renewal section and our proposed foundations for the program law. That is our role in terms of involvement: simply trying to get accountability legislation on the books.

27. I'm a supervisor of Program Evaluation and Research.

What Generated Your Interest in REACT Topics?

1. My interest was generated by the nature of my responsibilities.

2. We wanted to see what you were doing and were interested as to where we stood in comparison with what had already been done by other states.

3. Because of our earlier involvement in accountability, I felt it was a professional responsibility to be updated and become more effective as far as the accountability process is concerned.

4. This is our third year in an accountability program.

5. We have an ongoing plan which has components which are parallel with the accountability concept, and consequently I felt I could benefit by attending that REACT Conference. In particular, I was interested in the identification of needs and their documentation, the establishment of goals and objectives, the implementation of objectives and then, finally, the evaluation of the objective to determine the extent to which it was being achieved.

6. Most of the topics interested me because of the scope of our project and because we are all new to this. REACT seemed to us to be the best orientation. I had a little trouble picking which topical session I wanted to attend.

7. I was interested primarily in looking at systems approaches and procedural steps that other states and other districts have taken in approaching accountability. I was also very interested in monitoring management procedures and criterion-referenced measurement.

8. Policy-making implications were the ones that interested me most.

9. I had been in the job two or three weeks when I was sent to the REACT Conference to kind of get oriented to the accountability process. My contribution and frame of reference is that I came from the teaching field. I was a Title III program director with an LEA, and so I keep them thinking about utilization in accountability. We are accountable for the programs that we send out, and I keep saying, "We are creating things for real people to use."

   Prior to my present position, I was in needs assessment. I was in a staff development program in an urban school district. We attempted to discover the real needs in our school district with respect to teaching skills. We used an eclectic approach.

10. We had been writing performance objectives for math and language arts.

What Generated Your Interest in REACT Topics? (continued)

11. I had been a member of the accountability committee for three years, and it appeared the REACT Conference would deal directly with my concerns. My greatest problem was choosing which group to attend because they all seemed quite interesting. The most rewarding for me personally was the one on accountability issues.

12. I was not a REACT conferee, but I am familiar with the CAP materials.

13. My interest was generated by my responsibilities on the state advisory committee on assessment and encouraged by the state superintendent.

14. We are heavily committed to the concept of a shared responsibility in education.

15. My interest was more in the methodological topics that relate to how we can better design educational assessment programs.

16. We wanted to know what other states were doing in accountability.

17. I have been interested in accountability ever since I had a major argument with Leon Lessinger a number of years ago, mainly because I think accountability is a bugaboo issue. There are not many people around who have come to grips with what accountability is all about. I have done some reading and writing on it. I've worked with many school systems in terms of ways to move toward accountability. At the conference, I wanted primarily to get the overview.

18. I had been part of the old Belmont group when we started looking into some kinds of possibilities. I was interested in what accountability people were up to and what they had found.

19. I was interested mainly in communications.

20. In our Mid-Atlantic Interstate Project we have been dealing with shared accountability for the past two or three years. Because of the contact in and through this program, we felt the conference down at Tampa might have some meaning for us.

21. I was looking for a couple of specific items on the agenda. I was looking at some cost accounting that was presented, and I had hoped to find more answers than I did. I attended the session on statewide needs assessment because of my role, working here with the state on it. I was interested in the presentation by Florida, and it helped me make some personal decisions about what our state would do.

What Generated Your Interest in REACT Topics? (continued)

22. Simply a broader perspective, hoping to get a look at what others are doing and comparing it to what we're doing.

23. I was interested both in the program accountability phase and the personnel phase.

24. We have received the CAP materials regularly as they were mailed out. We have used some of them profitably in the written form. Also, our advisory committee was looking around for some additional input, so one of my staff members and the president, chairman, and vice-chairman of our state advisory committee were at that meeting.

25. I've always been in the curriculum business. I've always been interested in what can be done with all kinds of tools in terms of where, for so much input, you got some output. The thing I was primarily interested in was some of the things our State Department of Education had done. I read about that in several journals.

26. A general area of concern was to be in a place where I could talk to and share with other professionals in the field.

27. We're involved in a couple of projects here. We have been working in state assessment and also have the responsibility for putting together some kind of consolidated federal programs and evaluation approach which is trying to combine a number of federal programs for evaluation purposes; we must be able to respond to both our legislature and our federal government in that regard.

    A second reason for my interest in accountability is that the legislature a year ago, as part of the budget document, mandated that some accountability projects be developed in local school districts with some of the pilot projects. So we got together a number of school districts in a couple of areas of the state and asked them to take some aspects of accountability and tried them out in our own districts, developed some techniques and projects for reporting school activities, reporting achievement tests, and reporting general public disclosure to local constituencies.

    In looking over the agenda of the REACT Conference, I recall having gone with the director of the section here and the chairman and vice-chairman of the accountability and assessment advisory committee; we decided that there would be some things at the conference that would be of value to us. The presentation on dissemination of information was one of interest to us. Minnesota and Florida were making presentations with regard to their assessment program, and that was of some interest to us since we were embarking on small-scale pilot programs this spring.

How did the REACT Conference and/or Publications Affect Your Approach to Accountability?

1. We needed greater knowledge about accountability which CAP publications gave us more than any other publications. The conference gave us a chance to discuss, with a variety of people from a variety of states, their reactions and actions relative to accountability in their state. For me that is extremely valuable because quite often I get only one side. At Denver I got the other side.

   I did not experience a change of attitude, but perhaps gained a greater degree of hope that accountability is being looked at on a more logical basis than it had been before. But I did not change my direction of effort significantly. I felt a lot more comfortable with what we were piloting, especially when our effort was mentioned during the program as another method of accountability. That gave use some hope.

2. Very little as far as what we had started. I don't believe it has basically affected our approach. In the future we expect to learn from your experience in the management/cost-effective approach.

3. I felt the conference reminded me of the total perspective. Being an educational generalist, this probably impressed me more than anything. The conference really dealt with a total approach to accountability rather than only a few aspects.

   I did not change my philosophical approach, but it was rather enlarged and enriched.

   As a result of CAP, we are taking accountability more seriously and giving it more time. We had a negative reaction to accountability here in the district originally, and the term accountability was not really in good stead. The teachers were putting up road blocks. So this year was kind of a regeneration in that I feel we will act on what we find, and it really will make a difference.

   It has been a kind of rebirth on all levels as a result of our CAP contacts. We have focused on being able to come up with some very specific tasks, and CAP, in general, reestablished a visible accountability program in this district. We have also improved our mechanisms of communication from the bottom up. Task forces have been set up and made accountable for some very specific objectives.

4. That would be very difficult to pin down. I can't think of anything that would apply.

How Did the REACT Conference and/or Publications Affect Your Approach to Accountability? (continued)

5. It didn't really. Of course I had some basic background before I went to the conference. What I gained most from the conference was an interchange of ideas with those who were implementing the concept in their own states, particularly Dr. Coldiron from Pennsylvania. He has formulated an approach very similar to an approach that we are recommending in our state.

   I have made some changes as a result of my exposure to CAP materials. Previously, in the original design of the concept, we decided to go with minimum objectives. But rather than so classify them, we have decided to go with what we call common objectives.

   Right now this plan is in a developmental stage and is not being implemented, even though we have a bill that has passed the Legislature and has been approved by the Governor. But we do not have a formalized plan as yet because of the work that is still to be done by the advisory committees.

6. We have used extensively practically everything we got from the conference. Our group had really been stalled before the conference because we could not resolve the questions of who would ever submit to accountability. We had come to a dead stop. Leon Lessinger's speech was immensely important to me (Denver) in that it got the idea across that accountability is a system of assistance and not of inspection. I have taken that philosophy and expanded on it and presented it to other community groups. I have been getting <u>incredible</u> response from other groups; people say that this is the first time they have understood accountability. So I can tell you that, for us, it was ideal on the philosophical end.

   We used the publication on Roles extensively. We took out parts and distributed them, and people loved it. We have established in the library other publications: <u>Who's Afraid of Accountability?</u>, the <u>Bibliography</u>, and various others. People from the community come in and use them. I think they should be distributed more widely than they are. I think we have a most complete library, and the CAP publications are a substantial contribution to it.

   Specifically, CAP opened the doors for discussion. We had a good feel for what other states are doing. And the ability to confer with these other people at that conference was very valuable.

   I am from an area where there are a lot of tiny little school districts, and I heard someone from a large city say they couldn't relate to a district of 20,000 pupils when they had 250,000. But I approached it in this way: I thought of the smaller districts as being like a small

How Did the REACT Conference and/or Publications Affect Your Approach to Accountability? (continued)

cluster of our own schools with more local involvement. I could apply what they were doing to smaller models within a large school district. So that was valuable. The part on goals was fantastic. Some people had said you can't set goals for a big city, but I no longer think that is true.

7. The conference reassured me that we have a good philosophical base. I felt confident that I understood where I was going. We did not change anything as a result of the conference because I felt it was aimed primarily at statewide approaches. We are able to use very little in terms of specifics. What we did gain was a keener awareness and a stronger philosophical and conceptual base overall.

8. It did not, but that is not a negative reaction. Many of the things I heard there were things I agreed with, but did not turn out to be a lot of new material from my point of view. Most sessions I attended were reaffirmations of the views I had held for some time.

9. I have really used the material that I picked up. I just can't tell you how much and how frequently. I am involved in developing a career education development system, developing test instruments and a reporting system. I always keep going back to the CAP literature for phrases and for helpful ideas. I have really used particularly the EQA material from Pennsylvania, as we are getting into the affective domain. I am using the literature more and getting it into the mainstream of our office work because people who have been around a long time get a little bit jaded with experience. They are a little bit glib and flippant about even using the literature.

   Specifically, one of the summaries at REACT was on communication, and one of the things we have tried to do is keep an upward communications flow. I really used the ideas that came forth from that meeting. In writing valuable reports, I have tried to input as much as possible into our concerns the idea that teachers and administrators should give us their opinions on what's going on. It is not only knowledge and feedback, but a morale thing, and it gives us a credibility factor that I don't think we had. As an outcome of these feedback efforts, we have begun analyzing teacher comments to input into our data summary as part of our needs assessment.

10. The conference helped me realize that we need to focus on the process of education rather than just evaluation of people and also that accountability should operate locally rather than originate and be controlled on a statewide basis. I'm sure there are needs for state coordination, but to be most meaningful, it needs to be implemented at the local level.

How Did the REACT Conference and/or Publications Affect Your Approach to Accountability? (continued)

We used the Roles publication by copying applicable sections. It was discussed and was, I think, helpful.

11. I can't answer that I have done something differently because of the conference, but I think it had some effect. It gave me perspective on what is going on elsewhere in the country. One of the most valuable things was learning approaches other than what is being carried on in my state. The exchange of ideas helped me assess the rate and quality of our own progress. The materials I read from CAP helped me to assess this also.

    Since I do not have a background in education, I found many of the materials helpful in terms of explaining such things as the difference between the cognitive and affective domain.

    As a result of CAP, we also are able to design models for alternative schools which will take accountability concerns into the process at the outset, rather than haphazardly later on.

12. The materials provided additional information and resources. They provide an excellent vehicle for sharing the efforts and progress that others have made. One cannot afford, even with a well-defined design, not to look into the efforts that others have made. As a result of CAP materials, we could shed light on our own assessment procedures.

13. I think as far as overall impact and approach is concerned, one very evident impact was that what our legislature is concerned about is also a national concern. I found myself opposed to some hard-nosed approaches to accountability, and I look toward accountability more as a set of relationships between people to whom authority and responsibility are entrusted. The conference had little impact on my personal philosophy of accountability as something which we hold ourselves accountable for as opposed to something which is thrust upon us from the top down.

    The most valuable session was one in which I began to see the importance of communication systems and procedures to acquaint people with accountability matters in plain and simple layman's language. I also became more aware that there are many forms of accountability.

14. REACT reaffirmed our philosophy of sharing. Of nearly 40 teachers and administrators from our state at the conference, most left with the feeling that, in most of the states, the teacher was being held

more accountable than she should be. And it was brought to their attention that many of their activities were more assessment than accountability. And so it really had a good effect. Our philosophy of sharing and our humane approach were reinforced by REACT, as we were concerned that we were on the right track.

We rely on CAP to inform us about what everybody is doing.

We came away with the feeling that we had something very special. There may have been a few who thought accountability would simply go away, but once they got into it, they began to see that it is much too big to go away. The written material of CAP is just splendid. It has been most helpful to me.

15. There was very little effect from the conference itself. I probably get more out of the discussions I have with people outside of the sessions. I feel I gain something from professional discussion of this type in terms of problems of design and usage of assessment and accountability results.

16. We felt better after the conference because we felt we were moving in the right direction. I felt the conference was a big help to the dedicated but frustrated classroom teachers.

17. When I got to the conference, I became interested in the costing session. However, when I got to the costing session I realized that there was no insight to be gained in that session, mainly because I had been down a similar path before and found it was fraught with failure because the level of specificity that those guys were recommending might well make sense on paper in a theoretical way but, when you try to implement it in the field with honest-to-God living, breathing teachers, forget it. If you get data, it is going to be garbage. If teachers had to report that much, they wouldn't have time to teach. So they would go through a process of planning, not teaching, filling out forms, and fudging the data. I told them that. They probably weren't too excited to hear my criticism. I really think that one particular facet of REACT is a waste of taxpayer's money.

The conference and materials did not affect my approach at all. The major benefit I got from it was discussing the issues with people who were in similar positions of responsibility and getting a handle on the way they were reacting to local pressure and legislative pressure, and I shared some of my ideas with them.

How Did the REACT Conference and/or Publications Affect Your Approach to Accountability? (continued)

I would say that it was generally enjoyable. Buchmiller's presentation was excellent. He really did a fantastic job of tying together the various facets of accountability and legislative mandates and how accountability has grown and the extent to which people don't understand what it is.

I reacted openly to the keynote speech by saying that if the concept of accountability has so little substance that the principal speaker has to dwell on social issues for 80 per cent of his speech, then maybe we are all wasting our time.

We are not doing anything differently as a result of the conference, but I think those districts which are just getting into accountability probably benefitted greatly from it.

18. I thought the conference was terribly disappointing. But in general it's as far along as we can expect at this stage of the game. It does seem terribly slow to get anything done in accountability.

I thought the whole idea of the conference was quite scattered in terms of thrust, and I felt that there were people there talking about things they had done which were pretty miniscule or else had been done nine thousand times before and hadn't solved the problem.

There was a hell of a lot of sermonizing at the conference. Particularly by the Maryland group. I'm not sure that they don't have something pretty useful, provided they don't tell me it is now perfect. That just turned no end of people off. I sat next to a woman at the banquet who said the only reason she had stayed was to answer their (expletive deleted) fool questions.

I don't like people telling me how wonderful they are because I don't believe even I am that good.

19. A college professor did a good job on communications, but didn't give state people solutions on getting information out to the people. The problem is communication within our state. In my report to my boss, the state Superintendent, I stated that I attended the sessions on Issues and Accountability, Roles of the Participants in Accountability, Assessment and Evaluation, and Communication. I was pleased with the Assessment and Evaluation session. It made me aware of information on the kinds of data to collect and the instruments available to conduct the best program. It gave me procedures to use to analyze the assessment data and information on the utilization of the assessment itself. I was pretty pleased with those four sessions. They presented the Michigan Accountability Program and an

all-too-sophisticated communications model. It was so sophisticated, we'd never have time to implement it. We try to operate here on a very simplistic approach and try to get down to the nitty-gritty where the classroom teacher can understand what we're talking about. Overall, I thought the total workshop was very beneficial. The only segment that seemed to drag for me was the area of communication. It seems to me their problem was that the gentleman was quite knowledgeable in his field; he was just so sophisticated and knew so many facets of communication that he probably left out the most fundamental parts which he took for granted which the common, ordinary educator might not be aware of without a short course in it.

From our state's viewpoint, it was very beneficial to have our Senator down there. The interaction was real good. I was very pleased with his reaction. Mine was fine, and I learned a great deal from the Pennsylvania portion of it. This was an area I was trying to find out information in: the area of the affective. It was most beneficial to me and especially the pamphlets that were sent to me. The workshop itself, as far as I was concerned, was a rehash of what I already knew and, in talking to other states, I think they felt the same way. The educators and teachers that were there probably found it very beneficial. If this is your area, then you're pretty knowledgeable with most of the things, and with some things you will get additional information.

I was pleased with the contacts I made down there.

One other criticism: they didn't give us enough free time. They had us working all day and then a night session until nearly ten o'clock. There wasn't enough free time to get to know the people we were in the meetings with. There was a lot of good give-and-take, I thought.

20. I don't know whether they've affected us substantially one way or the other. We do receive the CAP materials. At our Mid-Atlantic Program, we've had Olson there on two or three occasions, bringing us up to date on where he is and what he's doing. We do look through the materials as they send them out. We've used them in some cases to see where other states are in accountability legislation, the type of legislation they have, the breadth, scope, how far it goes. That's our limit as far as using the CAP materials is concerned.

There isn't anything where I could say CAP caused us to do or not do this or that.

How Did the REACT Conference and/or Publications Affect Your Approach to Accountability? (continued)

21. We've been promoting a local needs assessment model as opposed to a statewide model. This is particularly essential for our state. For example, we have 14 recognized Indian tribes and one that isn't officially recognized, plus three different kinds of Spanish and some Oriental groups. We have such a diversity of population and ethnic groups that to come up with a state average just doesn't make much sense to us, and so we've sort of switched off the statewide assessment pattern that we'd worked on for about three years and gone into the development of the local needs assessment model with quite a few of the services being provided at the state level such as technical assistance in developing instruments and conducting a survey and this type of thing. I just felt, for the kind of services we wanted to render and the kind of information we wanted to generate, that for our purposes we were going in the right direction--helping the local agents develop their own needs assessment information.

22. My first response would be no, they did not have any significant impact on changing direction. Some of the conference sessions and speakers that we listened to reaffirmed some of the things we're doing, and it's nice to say we're doing something consistant with what others are doing. We haven't made any changes based on that. We're pretty deeply committed to this NIE requirement and want to give it time to work.

    I had a good reaction to the conference. It was a thing worth attending--just being able to obtain feedback in the form of hearing what others are doing.

23. We have reorganized the Department of Education as a whole, and we now have a Department of Accountability within the Department of Education. This is not totally a result of our contact with CAP, but the publications of CAP have been very helpful in developing goals and objectives for the Department to pursue in its operation of that Accountability Department within our own agency.

24. Well, I think the publication on designing the assessment program was influential in helping us come up with a design. Not that we changed anything, but it helped us during the forming stage. I would say the session dealing with the public information activities in Michigan helped us avoid pitfalls. It did not change our direction in the formative stage, but helped us set more intelligent goals than we might have otherwise.

25. It has given me new material that I can talk with the school district people about. I keep a set of publications close at hand in my office.

How Did the REACT Conference and/or Publications Affect Your Approach to Accountability? (continued)

Sometimes I give it to people and recommend that they procure some of these publications.

26. It reinforced things that I learned earlier and made me more comfortable with the kind of proposal that we had before the time that the conference occurred. I went with the hopes of having some top-flight people react to our proposal, and I managed to get that done in one small group seminar.

27. We went there because we wanted some specifics to help us to do some parts of accountability. We knew one of the big factors we would like to have in our accountability project here in our local districts was this notion of communicating with the public, and so rather than going there with the question, Is that a good thing to do?, we went there trying to get some information on how to do that job the best way we could. Some of the ideas that we got from the presentation were helpful to us. I think the vice-chairman of our committee, who was also at that time the president-elect of the state PTA, was particularly impressed with the presentation. He thought some of the ideas he got on communicating with the public would be helpful.

School people made use of the ideas in the local projects. We brought back materials as well as made the directors aware of the CAP Project, and a couple have had their names put on the mailing list.

Were the Influences of CAP and REACT Transmissible to Others?

1. Yes, they were. I have written for more materials and given them to every staff person. Other materials and notes were transmitted to the pilot schools and the task force that oversees the state accountability project.

3. Our accountability image was so low that I was the only one at the conference, but now all the key people have read the materials. The materials are clearly written and so well done that I have become the disseminator of the content.

4. I would say that people have been able to pick this stuff up and identify with it; I know we have.

5. Yes, I think so, as I have been able to utilize many of the materials with other people who are interested in the concept, particularly the advisory committee members. They have been exposed to at least some of the materials.

6. They were. I came back very enthusiastic and much less pessimistic about what can be done, and I believe this has been transmitted to various groups in this area (such as Board of Education, Urban Coalition, Urban League, local school associations). Most of them have sent representatives to our committee now and joined, whereas before they didn't want anything to do with us. A week after the REACT Conference, I was guest speaker at a meeting attended by the teacher's union, School Administrators Association, community groups (which have generally been at loggerheads). They were all there to promote teacher accountability, a concept which I had introduced because of the REACT Conference. For the first time we were able to talk without getting at each other's throats. I was still high from the REACT Conference, and I felt this was one of the benefits. They still had differences, but with the systems approach, they found more areas of agreement and could work together.

7. The people I needed to discuss it with also attended the conference, so I don't know if I can answer your question in your terms. The conference did make it easier to communicate with those people; however, I have not tried to communicate these concerns to others.

9. Yes. One of the best ways to use the material would be to place them in the offices of every school district. I would like to do this myself. I would like to see some kind of guidelines coming from CAP to allow us to do this.

10. I have not really read the CAP materials that much.

Were the Influences of CAP and REACT Transmissible to Others? (continued)

11. Yes, in two senses. Those of us who went to the conference did reports on the conference at our next meeting. In addition, we reproduced some eight or ten pages of the materials which we passed on to committee members. It seemed to be well understood when used with a large number of new members to orient them to what accountability was locally, statewide and nationwide.

13. The ideas on communication were useful to our committee which has a problem in this area. We tend to be at odds with the legislature in that we entrust a great deal of decision making to people on the firing line (the individual schools), whereas the legislature has a "shape up or ship out" philosophy. We have scheduled a meeting with legislators in August, and we plan to communicate with them in laymen's terms.

14. I cannot say that they were transmissible up to now, because we took everyone involved to the REACT Conference.

16. We are going to have inservice training on accountability in our district, and it will probably take the form of the REACT Conference, but not in so much detail.

    I really felt the materials and ideas were transmissible. After the conference, we all had a great deal more confidence in explaining to people what accountability is all about. My audience would be school teachers, students and parents.

19. Yes, I believe that it was. In the area of evaluation and assessment, I could transmit to others, but not in the area of communications. I'd say 50-50 there.

20. I doubt it. Let me qualify my statement this way: I sat in on the finance section down at Tampa. I think, in theory, they have things going, but I think it was brought out in the session, at least the one I attended, that a whole lot of it was still theoretical and it's pretty hard to attach a dollar figure to it and prove cost-affectiveness clear along the line in everything you do. I don't think they refined it to that point. I think it could be attacked, at least by the skeptics. I'm not saying that they're not on the right track. I'm not saying that what they're doing isn't worthwhile. I am just saying I feel that they need to work on it a good while longer before they go out with it generally. I think they had a sympathetic audience down there in many respects. But if you'd start that with some of the people here, you'd be in deep water real fast.

Were the Influences of CAP and REACT Transmissible to Others? (continued)

21. Yes. I have read the materials I picked up. I've seen some value in them.

22. Not in a direct way.

23. It was transmissible to the Board of Education and the local school districts, particularly by the administrators.

25. I think some of it is very ready for use by people out in the school districts. I think that a lot of times the problem is making people aware. The immediate concern is that they don't take time to step back and look.

26. In terms of my own staff, yes. In terms of my interaction with education agency personnel both at the conference and at home, afterward, I would say yes. We developed a consensus of thought regarding where we were in our state, where we needed to go, and where the emphasis needed to be for the next few years. It served a good purpose in that regard.

27. I think in the Minnesota and Florida presentation a good deal of the material we found useful was in the form of verbal presentations with the aid of overhead. We were really taking away notes and summaries. I am not sure that the materials are usable in their original form; we would have to modify them for use in our own state. We have made use of the materials. We have shared CAP materials with legislative staff and committees, we have used them as sources for making presentations both to the legislature and committee groups as well as to school people.

What are Your Unmet Accountability Needs? How Might They be Met?

1. We need an ongoing, description type of publication describing what is occuring throughout the country. Getting together is fine, but an awful lot happens each year. Accountability is an ever-changing thing. There's got to be some method of updating people, on a periodic basis, that are involved in any and all sides of accountability. NEA and AERA do it for some areas, but we need someone who is relatively neutral.

2. Quite a few. We have ahead of us a massive job of changing attitudes toward accountability. And by that I mean everyone's attitudes. We define accountability as the responsibilities of everyone touched by the education process, from the governor down to the learner. But our concern is on the educator-parent level. Another unmet need is that of the technical skills needed to implement an accountability concept.

3. We need some work in the area of staff development. Because of our small size, some of the task groups have not really developed. We have no clearly defined student outcomes in some curricular areas. To meet these needs, we need more time to work out management systems and also better methodologies for assessing student growth.

4. One area (from an assessment point of view as an approach to accountability) is that people don't know what kind of information they need and how to do the whole dissemination bit. I have been asking, What kind of information do I give legislators? What kind do I give the public? How do I do that? and so forth. There are some things that have been done on it, but I just haven't found anything very useful. Another area that has not been filled is trying to describe how to get at the process of exemplary-type programs. Maybe we just aren't at that stage in terms of research, but no one seems to really be focusing on that. By exemplary I mean those factors that really make a difference.

   I would like to see some hard research in a couple of those areas. NIE is putting money into dissemination, but I think we need to do more in the same format as CAP itself, maybe get a group of states who are interested in improving the dissemination and use of information of testing programs and really take a hard look at it from a research standpoint. I think that the evaluation of these programs is related to that. We seem so worried about some of these programs being cut back or phased out. Why is this happening? We often find it's because we've never ever given a report to our state legislature. I really think we ought to be developing dissemination models and evaluation models for assessment programs so that we can begin to zero in on what the needs of people are.

I have read the CAP publications on dissemination, and I feel that we are around the edges yet. I don't think they got into it deeply enough.

5. Only insofar as to get across the point to classroom teachers that the accountability concept does not begin and end with them. We have reactions from teachers here in this state who feel that they are the ones being held accountable and not the system itself. And that is just a matter of communication as I see it. We will be conducting workshops throughout the state, speaking to various groups like the Department of Classroom Teachers, superintendents, and principal groups at their professional meetings. So through that type of communication, I think, we will be able to get across the point.

6. Most of the things I read I have to translate and communicate in much more general language. We have to be more concise and more general. Forget the educator's jargon and produce more readable documents. I think the whole area of roles, in my state in particular, is not understood well. Especially the state's role in assessment and accountability. We need more communication within the state, between people who are attempting these changes.

7. We need to move in the area of teacher's performance evaluation. Not that teachers are not avidly and earnestly using good techniques. But we haven't standardized many approaches. We haven't articulated any curriculum in my district to the point that we feel it is functional from year to year. We are only embryonically involved with accountability in this area. We have to establish a system of objectives.

8. How does one get accountability information to policymakers? This involves looking at the operation of the political process. People in accountability need some skill in that area. That process would involve an analysis of what kinds of sources policy makers get their information from and what kinds of horse trading is done at all levels of policymaking from the legislator to the school board.

9. Probably making accountability a less negative term. We ought to tie accountability to improvement of programs and that kind of thing. Somehow, particularly in our large school system, it has become tied to teacher accountability and negotiations. We need to get a handle, through the communications thing, on letting people know we are sincere.

What are Your Unmet Accountability Needs? How Might They be Met? (continued)

10. We have had some problems with local criterion-referenced tests because parents say they want statewide comparisons. We have not resolved the problem, and it may be CAP could help us there.

    We were not very successful in our needs assessment at the building level. Our problems were more mechanical than anything else. We could use help in using those needs assessment data in setting goals.

11. Our main problem has been in defining our role as a committee: whether we are to be a policy or a working committee. One of your publications got very deeply into this and has helped us considerably.

    Another problem has been getting and keeping student involvement. One of our real fears is that it is all too easy to wind up in a business-as-usual posture within the school district, so that educators are doing the same kinds of things they were doing anyway, but attaching the name accountability to the activities. It is tough to know to what extent we are succeeding in our task because of the dark connotations of the word accountability for many teachers and administrators.

13. I need to generate a simple working definition of accountability with the stress on the word simple. Locally, how do you translate the accountability philosophy and methodology into simple enough terms so that they can easily be used by teachers and principals at the level of the local school as well as by students themselves? Right now we are calling it by another name, since accountability has such bad overtones. Basically I am talking about reducing all the sophisticated terms of accountability to the point where people can use them.

14. Our unmet needs are that, after a year of attitude formation, we need more technical information, especially in the affective area. (I really must give credit to Pennsylvania. At Tampa, everyone was willing to share what they had done including Pennsylvania, Maryland, Oklahoma. The list goes on.) I am talking about criterion-referenced tests and teacher-made materials. We need measurement that would substantiate or validate what we are doing.

    We really need a consultant source to teach us how to inservice our school districts in this area. We don't have sufficient trained personnel who understand the concepts. What we've got is everybody on third base and nobody getting home.

What are Your Unmet Accountability Needs? How Might They be Met? (continued)

15. One problem that we need to meet is that of additional usage of the information collected by National Assessment for assessment programs at the state and local level.

    We should address ourselves also to the problem of bias in standardized tests.

    CAP should support a project to lay these problems out and perhaps ask help from NAEP so that such a project could be more sensitive to the NAEP materials and to the needs of local and state agencies.

    Also, we should look into school finance and bring it together with performance information.

16. The materials should be cast in less formal terms and talk more about the need for accountability to be a shared responsibility.

17. The unmet needs we have are needs which basically can't be met, and that's the whole issue of explaining to the public the complexities of educational evaluation and that things are not as simple as they appear to be at the outset. We just keep hammering away at this. I don't believe any conference will help with that. There was a communication subconference at CAP, but I did not go to it. My guess would be that they went through the standard stuff about getting community input and so on. It's the kind of thing that everyone knows how to do in a textbook setting but is very difficult to pull off in the field.

18. I wish we could do a better evaluation of Title I. I don't know whether the answer is for an accountability project to start looking at the possibility of developing something in the direction of federal programs, something less than the whole damn world that they're taking on now.

    We were saying we should spend $300 per pupil seven years ago, and I think we ought to have better figures based on a better system of accounting. We have a great differential between per-pupil expenditures among districts. We need also some way of establishing data bases.

19. We ought to have a National Forum on a coffee break. I think they ought to have a national conference and call in people from all over the U.S. with like concerns about education and put up titles at each table and say, We're going to discuss accountability at this table and evaluation at that table, something of this nature. Let these people just come and sit down and discuss what's going on,

what problems they've got, and how they're meeting what problems they've run into. I'm afraid you'd never get it on a federal program.

I think more detailed information in the area of evaluation would be beneficial. A stronger area of need for me and also for the entire U.S. is the affective area. I know some people are doing some things with instruments or they're doing some things on a limited basis, but a good conference in this area would really be beneficial for states that are way behind, and I kind of consider us way behind.

I think if we had more information in the area of communication that was on a lower level, perhaps more of a layman's level, it would probably be more beneficial than some of these sophisticated models that they might come up with. Whatever we get from these conferences, we're going to have to be able, in turn, to give to our local education agencies and superintendents that just have not had any background in this area. So it's got to be on an average to low-average level.

20. You have to recognize our position and the nature of our office: we're pretty much staff of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. We don't implement programs, we help plan in that respect. We do related research and the things that I've mentioned. We are involved very much in a Quality Education Study in our research component. We're trying to expand our assessment program as a consequence of this. We're trying to look at our goals of education and trying to develop instrumentation that will measure all of those as best we can. We had to use some of your materials from Pennsylvania. We field-tested a lot of that this year. We tried to do a statistical, frequent look at this and see what other factors may infringe upon how well students do in education. I don't think this is definitive yet. I think it points more toward the need for additional research rather than giving you the answers you want right now. This is the kind of thing we're doing in research. We don't have a large staff, and we're trying to broaden our assessment program through these and some other efforts.

21. We still need some elements of the needs assessment model, but particularly student assessment. Our state is moving into a very heavy accountability process. The Legislature has passed mandates of various kinds, and the procedures for implementing the mandates fall on the Department of Education to be developed and implemented. So our need is to generate these local methods and procedures. Essentially it is the local people that have to come up with the data and get the programs started.

What are Your Unmet Accountability Needs? How Might They be Met? (continued)

We need all kinds of criterion-domain related instruments including the research and everything that goes with the development of these instruments. There's still a great need, and I'm sure this is a national thing. People want to know how our students compare to the national norms. As soon as you get into that mess then you get out of criterion reference, so we need a kind of a dual and almost singularly incompatible type of design or instrument package that could give us the criterion of success and yet in some manner have it referenced to a national population.

23. I think we have to pursue them. I am not sold on the state law of accountability at this point. I think it has to have some volunteerism. I think all of the professional help you can get prior to legislation is what is needed, and CAP has been very helpful in that direction.

    I think, in the administrative renewal process towards accountability, that the local school districts need to be in line with the communication front as much as the departments of education. I think that, if CAP is going to continue, it should help the departments of education in mailing these materials out. Sometimes local school districts will take information from a national project that it won't digest from the department of education.

24. We have a state legislature that, for some reason, is much interested in every-pupil testing. It would be nice to come out with some powerful statements and very powerful pupil sample programs to make more sense. If you have one of those documents around, that would be helpful.

25. We need more people trained in measurement and evaluation techniques in school districts. It's hard to make this a low-cost kind of thing. It is a tremendous expenditure to really measure program effectiveness. People don't want to spend. This is a cost-reduction time.

26. We're not successful in the legislative process in convincing the Legislature that they should invest money in the accountability process. We have two kinds of needs. First, develop some means of having decision makers value accountability procedures and mechanisms enough to invest in them. I think a large part of our problem is in understanding on the part of the legislators. Materials communicate very effectively what is desired and how it can be accomplished in local school districts. It involves a mound of paper work. Second, we need a measure of achievement which is meaningful and can be utilized. Our tools for product accountability are crude. Some states have moved out following the national assessment project in a

What are Your Unmet Accountability Needs? How Might They be Met? (continued)

manner which gets the show on the road, but we are a long way from home in regard to significant measures of variances.

27. The major responsibility is program evaluation. We're still struggling with getting a successful program in operation, one that will be acceptable to legislators and school districts.

    We have pilot testing this spring and hope to enlarge this year. We have been making use of the national assessment materials and following a model somewhat similar to Minnesota's. The idea of doing a relatively small sample at state level would encourage school districts to join with us by making use of the material and experience it in their own school districts and then make use of the state activities as a profile to relate to their own activities.

What Other Kinds of Accountability Materials Would You Like to See?

1. I like what is there, but it becomes obsolete or changed. Most of the material I've seen has been quite extensive and quite good, but needs to be updated in the future. They should remain in print as long as they are relevant.

2. I have everything CAP puts out. We feel we have, at this point, what's necessary to move forward. Later on we may have need for other products. Right now we are beginning to feel pretty comfortable with what we're doing. People want to know step-by-step procedures. We've published such a handbook ourselves in a kind of cookbook style. I feel others would profit from such materials when they are very practical.

3. That's a tough question. The materials that have been developed to date really do the job. We possibly need some kind of media other than print, such as transparencies, filmstrips, etc., to translate more of the content.

4. I can't think of any right now.

5. One thing that I would recommend: I know that there are banks of subject matter objectives as well as affective objectives. Many states are collecting those sorts of things. But they are not available to everyone who wants them, without a fee. I know that I cannot see banks that are available from all the sources, and so it would be desirable to have one complete listing of objectives by subject area and grade level rather than inventing our own... We also need more information on teacher accountability.

6. I would like an ongoing reference service so that you could write and find out what other people are doing in these areas (models, goal formation, evaluation). It would save money and give you a nice overview. We need more communicative-type materials.

8. My major concern is the collection of data that feeds into the accountability process. We don't have all the answers there either in terms of models or in terms of material. The packaging and arranging of assessment materials needs a lot of attention. But the materials are not the most important need. We need problem clinics, etc. The REACT Conference functioned about as well as anything else in terms of our present knowledge about how we impart not so much knowledge, but wisdom.

9. We need new materials which allow sharing of experiences such as was done at the REACT, in a friendly, non-threatening atmosphere.

What Other Kinds of Accountability Materials Would You Like to See? (continued)

10. We need how-to materials on transmitting needs assessment data into decision making. People in our district rated the affective areas higher than the cognitive areas, e.g., the human relations development and values development of kids. That's a hard one, and we could really use some help. We also need to know about what kinds of programs are available in this area, such as values education.

11. I'd like to see a clearing house for accountability events of all kinds going on, not only in states, but at the school district level. It would save us a lot of reinventing the wheel.

12. Our biggest need right now is in the area of inservice education for teachers.

13. I've been very much impressed by the work that is going on in San Jose, California; call it accountability or PPBS, or whatever you want to. They have developed some simple, usable materials at the level of individual schools for developing programs that are supported by federal funds. They are the kinds of home-developed materials that average people can use. I would like to see these kinds of materials published or made available to other schools where they can be used.

14. I would love to hope that there was some way CAP could help us in our technical problems, but I don't know how. How can we benefit from others' experience from an inservice point of view and train teachers in school districts interested in accountability? I would recommend that CAP materials be extended to a manual on how to go beyond what has been printed, providing a step-by-step approach on how to implement.

15. I think there are certain elements of the project that should be thought about in that they should be more oriented to the practitioners of assessment, such as the element of costing, and also some of the issues that relate to how we can better design an assessment program that will meet both the state and the local needs. Some people are looking into these areas, but I think CAP should be in the forefront.

    The next step of accountability is going to be at the local level, and so CAP should be crossing the bridge also.

    There are certain statistical and methodological problems. It is my view that we haven't been using the regression technique properly. CAP should publish more on these kinds of problems.

What Other Kinds of Accountability Materials Would You Like to See? (continued)

16. We need more materials on what is going on in other states. I would like to see more publications by Leon Lessinger.

17. More information as to cost-benefit type analyses would be helpful. There has got to be a way of describing, in simpler fashion, various educational programs in terms not only of their benefits but their costs. There is a lot of technical information in the field, but that does the professional in the field little good when he has to report to a board that is not technically competent. It just seems to me that there should be a workbook approach available which one could use if one wanted to.

18. We need to talk about techniques of accountability and how to do them. Everybody thinks that if you sit every (expletive deleted) child down on Thursday and test him that you've got all the data you'll ever need for knowing exactly where he stands. But you know and I know that all you've got is a bunch of data that nobody knows what to do with, because there are no parameters against which to judge.

20. I don't know of anything.

23. I'm sure there are. I can't think of any offhand.

    I've not read all of the CAP materials, but I certainly scanned all of them. I read in depth when I see a topic that is of immediate concern to me.

24. Some of the documents I studied more carefully than others. I think that we need one set of questions to look at the different styles of accountability systems that you would develop if you were doing one for a school as the base unit as compared to the district.

25. I would like to see more work done in the affective area, even though I think there is a danger: I think that it can appeal to a lot of sentimentality. I would like to see something done that would determine more cognitive kinds of learning.

26. In terms of the political process, I have been looking for some ideas for identifying successful accountability practices in local school districts. I am trying to develop a list of lighthouse practices. Very few school districts have got the whole ball of wax. Some school districts are involved in management objectives and are being successful, and others are doing things as far as computer storage and retrival of meaningful information about students and faculty and other things throughout their school district. I think we can identify some components of the system that are now functioning in local school

What Other Kinds of Accountability Materials Would You Like to See? (continued)

districts. If we can get some legislators in to visit those programs during the biennium, I think it would help our cause in terms of understanding operationally what is meant by the words in the proposed bill.

27. The biggest need is for the use of materials that are focused on or useful to small school districts. A number of accountability materials that we are familiar with would require a certain degree of sophistication as well as time and effort on the part of a lot of people. It gets to be a bit overwhelming. In our state we have somewhere around 100 districts with fewer than 300 students in them, and when we talk about districts like that with so few people involved, you would think accountability would be easy. On the other hand it is an overwhelming task for a lot of them, so materials developed with the small district in mind would be helpful.

Should CAP Materials Remain in Print?

1. CAP should continue. I like the concept, the possibility of people getting together from all viewpoints, and the materials are certainly worthwhile.

2. The effect you made so far is very good. They should very definitely remain in print. We need to keep abreast of the kinds of accountability legislation and programs that are going on in various states. That would be very useful to us.

3. Yes, but with expansion to meet the needs of various audiences.

5. Yes, very much so.

6. They should not only remain in print but should be sent to libraries and school systems whether they are solicited or not. Every pedagogical library should have them.

7. They need to, yes. They can be very helpful for state-level people, but not for the classroom teacher.

8. Frank Womer's book should remain around awhile. The dissemination material should have more attention.

9. OK, yes! Definitely! This is the best collected body of materials that we've got on accountability. We are just beginning to scratch the surface of accountability, and right now is when we need these materials most. This has just reached the top layer. We have to give it time to filter down to the people. If it goes out of print, how are we going to do that?

11. Yes, if for no other reason than the turnover of committee personnel at the local level. Each new group has to learn what it's all about These materials can really be helpful.

13. I think the CAP effort has to continue for the purpose of storing that kind of information so it can, at some time, be assessed when we have figured out the technology for doing so.

14. Yes. I would recommend that more be produced.

15. I think the project should be continued because it provides an information base.

16. Yes, I surely do. In an updated form, of course.

17. I am not familiar with the CAP materials and so cannot comment on their quality.

Should CAP Materials Remain in Print? (continued)

18. Oh, sure. Why not?

19. Most of them should. A lot of them could be updated. I find them lengthy. I think the CAP materials could be digested. It might even be a good title for some of them: A Digest of Information. Because of the time and effort required to read them, it would be beneficial if they could reduce some of this down into common ordinary language, 1-2-3 type form.

20. Yes. I think they're worthwhile. I think they help bring this whole thing together, and I don't think this is just a jag or something the country's off on. I think it's a worthwhile thing.

21. I think they provide generally good information. Yet, they're not exactly targeted for our needs, sometimes. I couldn't speak for anyone else. I'm sure they do meet other people's needs quite well.

23. I would like to see the dissemination center of CAP retained. I would like to see federal grants that could keep those documents flowing as long as they could. I think that we should request of the states that maybe CAP come into the states and hold one-day workshops that would be just acquainting local school boards and school administrators with the materials that you have and pointing out the concepts contained in those publications. Then maybe we should recycle the leadership of these states one more time, and get two or three people from each department that are definitely familiar with accountability and the materials that we have, and how they can be applied to local situations regardless of the size of the school district. When we get this, I think it is still a matter of inservice training and dissemination of information.

25. Yes, I think there is a lot of positive material there. Some places raise more questions than provide answers. The whole element of exploring this business of accountability has provoked me sometimes to propose within myself some alternatives. Publicize it. Make people aware of it.

26. Yes.

27. The ones that I have seen should be kept available. I have not looked at all of them.

Have You Any Other Comments You Would Like to Make Concerning CAP or the REACT Conference?

3. You did an excellent job at the conference of getting a cross-section of various interest groups talking about accountability.

4. I'm very positive towards both the REACT Conferences and the CAP project. I think that the formats of the conferences have been such that people can get in and do some sharing, and to me that's been very helpful. The REACT Conference in Denver was one of the better conferences I've been at all year. It's very tough getting time to read all the materials. There ought to be more of a tie between the documents produced and the conferences themselves. They should be used as a basis for discussion at the conferences.

6. I thought it was great, because we could see that others had done the groundwork, and we could approach the topics with an open mind, which was extremely valuable. The conference was so good that I want to go to another one, and I'm really disappointed that they are not going to be around.

8. There ought to be some work done in putting accountability in context in relation to education as a whole, showing education's recognition of its misuses of accountability and showing why it is nedessary to also do something about instructional strategies and things of that sort, as well as being concerned with the accountability end of it.

9. I personally was very open when I went to the REACT Conference and wanted to learn something, and I really did. I get follow-up material from CAP all the time that is very helpful.

14. SEAR has been most helpful to me. I had given away all my materials on state legislation, and Phyllis Hawthorne dictated to me on the phone the information I needed in a hurry. And so it is that kind of rapport that I think is right. So I am a strong, strong CAP supporter. I think that we really have benefitted from what you are doing, and we want to commend you on it. We will more than verbally support you. I don't know if there is anything constructive that I could say that would improve CAP because you already have a good thing going. There is no one in the nation that puts out better materials than CAP does, as far as I am concerned.

17. Maybe what CAP ought to do is go into a school system that is accountable and take a look at the materials they use and use those as specimens to give a little more specific information. Too often the conference people were dealing with generalities. People already know the generalities, they just don't know how to translate them into paper-and-pencil products which are consumable by the public and by the board.

Have You Any Comments You Would Like to Make Concerning CAP or the REACT Conference? (continued)

19. CAP itself has been very beneficial. The REACT Conference I thought was a good one. I felt like it could have been expanded because we only got to cover the four areas.

21. I did think the cost accounting method is a critical one. I wasn't happy with what I did see there. I'm not putting anybody down. I think it's the state of the art; but there is a need again, nationally, for some manner in which we could present the kind of cost data that so many lay groups would like, such as legislatures and state boards of education. That's our audience, and we need to answer to them and probably develop formats that are compatible with their needs and yet are of some use to us. I think that would be a good venture: to really home in on what these people would like in terms of how the facts should be presented and go with that format.

23. I think the Policy Board and Art Olson have done an outstanding job. I think that this is the kind of project that has been very helpful, and I hope the federal government does too. I hope that they would assist us in associating with one another across the nation and helping us to go forward. I hope the USOE will continue to fund CAP, either by appropriation or discretionary funds at the Commissioner level, and not let them all go out during one administration.

25. I enjoyed my time there and the people that I met were nice. I sat in with people from Baltimore. There were capable people there.

26. There is potential for Southern Regional Education Board, Education Commission of the States, and the National Legislative Conference for relationships with legislators in our state to assist in the process.

APPENDIX I

THE TWO SURVEY FORMS

COOPERATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY PROJECT
QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS: This questionnaire is designed to obtain your reactions and comments about publications you have received from the Cooperative Accountability Project. Use the publication identification letters below to facilitate your completion of the questionnaire. Please record your answers on the separate answer form.

Identification Letter	Publication
A	Characteristics of and Proposed Models for State Accountability Legislation. Phyllis Hawthorne and Archie Buchmiller. April 1973. Wisconsin.
B	Developing a Large Scale Assessment Program. Frank B. Womer. July 1973. Minnesota.
C	Roles of the Participants in Educational Accountability. Carl E. Wilsey and Glenn B. Schroeder. 1974. Colorado.
D	Annotated Bibliography of the State Educational Accountability Repository. Phyllis Hawthorne. Revised April 1974. Wisconsin.
E	Predictors of Achievement: A Bibliography. Gordon Hanson. September 1973. Wisconsin.
F	A Dissemination System for State Accountability Programs. Erwin P. Bettinghaus and Gerald R. Miller. 1973. Michigan.
G	Using Educational Indicators for Program Accountability. Michael J. Grady, Jr. September 1974. Colorado.
H	Education in Focus: A Collection of State Goals for Elementary and Secondary Education. Alan Zimmerman. 1972. Wisconsin.
I	Who's Afraid of Educational Accountability? Lesley H. Browder, Jr. 1975. New York.

QUESTIONS

1. Place a check mark (✓) in the box below the letter corresponding to the publication(s) you have received.

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING ITEMS FOR THE PUBLICATIONS YOU CHECKED IN QUESTION 1.

2. For each publication checked, please record the number which best describes your use of it.

   (1) Read the whole publication in detail.
   (2) Read portions of the publication in detail.
   (3) Skimmed the publication.
   (4) Have not read the publication yet.

3. Which of the publications you have received have you shared with others? (Check all which apply)

4. Which publications have you requested additional copies of for distribution? (Check all that apply)

5. Which of the CAP publications you received have assisted you directly in decision-making about educational accountability in your job? (Check all that apply)

6. Check the two CAP publications that have been most useful to you.

7. Listed below are a number of areas in which CAP publications might have value to you. For each area please record the number which best indicates how useful the checked publications have been.

   (1) Very useful
   (2) Somewhat useful
   (3) Of little use

   (a) General information purposes.
   (b) Planning an assessment program.
   (c) Developing new accountability legislation.
   (d) Developing educational goals.
   (e) Developing a dissemination program.
   (f) Identifying resources related to accountability.
   (g) Other (Please record in the space provided on the answer sheet).

8. Listed below are a number of reasons why you may not have found the CAP publications useful. For those publications not found to be useful, please check each reason that applies.

   (a) The publication provided very little new information.
   (b) The publication was not relevant to my needs.
   (c) The publication was too long.
   (d) The publication contained too much specific data and not enough useful general information.
   (e) Other (Please record in the space provided on the answer sheet).

9. Listed below are a number of reasons why you might have requested CAP publications. For each reason listed, check the appropriate boxes for each publication you received.

   (a) General information purposes.
   (b) Assist in planning an assessment program.
   (c) Assist in developing new accountability legislation.
   (d) Help develop educational goals.
   (e) Assist in developing a dissemination program.
   (f) Other (Please record in the space provided on the answer sheet).

10. What is your present occupation? Please record in the space provided on the answer sheet.

11. Please add any comments you wish regarding the Cooperative Accountability Project publications. For example, in what other ways could the Cooperative Accountability Project be helpful to you or your organization with regard to accountability issues? (Please comment in the space provided on the answer sheet).

COOPERATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY PROJECT ANSWER FORM

		Publication Identification									Card Cols.
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	
1. Publications received											(1) 8-16
2. Amount read											17-25
3. Publications shared											26-34
4. Requested additional copies											35-43
5. Assisted in decision making											44-52
6. Two most useful publications											53-61
7. Degree of value found with respect to:											
a. General information	a										62-70
b. Planning assessment programs	b										71-79
c. Developing legislation	c										(2) 8-16
d. Developing educational goals	d										17-25
e. Developing dissemination program	e										26-34
f. Identifying accountability resources	f										35-43
g. Other_____	g										44-52
8. Reasons why CAP publications not useful											
a. Very little new information	a										53-61
b. Not relevant to my needs	b										62-70
c. Publication too long	c										71-79
d. Insufficient general information	d										(3) 8-16
e. Other_____	e										
9. Reasons for requesting CAP publications											
a. General information purposes	a										17-25
b. Planning assessment program	b										26-34
c. Developing accountability legislation	c										35-43
d. Develop educational goals	d										44-52
e. Develop dissemination program	e										53-61
f. Other _____	f										62-70

10. Present occupation _____ 71-72

11. Additional comments _____

_____

_____

COOPERATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY PROJECT
QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS: This questionnaire is designed to obtain your reactions and comments about publications you have received from the Cooperative Accountability Project. Use the publication identification letters below to facilitate your completion of the questionnaire. Please record your answer on the separate answer form.

Identification Letter	Publication
A	Characteristics of and Proposed Models for State Accountability Legislation. Phyllis Hawthorne and Archie Buchmiller. April 1973.
B	Developing a Large Scale Assessment Program. Frank B. Womer, July 1973. Minnesota.
C	Roles of the Participants in Educational Accountability. Carl E. Wilsey and Glenn B. Schroeder. 1974. Colorado.
D	Legislation By The States: Accountability and Assessment in Education. Phyllis Hawthorne. Revised August 1974. Wisconsin.
E	Costs of Educational Accountability: A Maryland Exploratory Study. November 1974. Maryland.
F	State Goals for Elementary and Secondary Education. Susan Ketchum Ribble. Revised September 1973. Wisconsin.
G	Accountability: A Bibliography. Gordon Hanson. July 1973. Wisconsin.
H	Keeping the Public Informed: Accent on Accountability. A digest of the Michigan Dissemination model. Erwin P. Bettinghaus and Gerald R. Miller. 1973. Michigan.
I	Indicators and Statewide Assessment. Robert Clemmer, Dwight Fairbanks, Mary Hall, James Impara and Charles Nelson. March 1974. Oregon.

APPENDIX II

Impact Study II Flyers

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BOX 911, HARRISBURG, PA. 17126
Phone AC 717 - 787-4234
BUREAU OF PLANNING AND EVALUATION
Division of Educational Quality Assessment

Dear

Because you have attended a REACT conference, I wish to enlist your cooperation in a follow-up study of your reaction to the Cooperative Accountability Project, its methods and materials. I am specifically interested in the impact of CAP materials on your accountability problems.

Here is how the study is designed. If you wish to participate, complete and return the form below by June 9, 1975, showing the dates and times you will be available for a telephone interview, and your telephone number. We will then call you and tape-record your answers to a series of questions on the above topics. This format will allow you to react quickly and freely to our questions and any other points you think important. Enclosed is a copy of the questions we will be asking.

When the study is completed, you will receive a copy of the results.

May we count on you? Feedback is as vital to us as it is to you in your accountability concerns. Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

EWS/pes
Enclosures

Eugene W. Skiffington
Assessment Specialist

(Cut along this line and mail completed questionnaire in the stamped, self-addressed envelope enclosed)

MAIL TO:
Eugene W. Skiffington, EQA Division, Dept. of Education, Box 911, Harrisburg, PA 17126. Yes, I will be available for a telephone interview.
My office telephone is (AC) _____.
You may call me any of the following times: (Please list at least 3 different working days between June 15-30, 1975)

DATE	TIME AVAILABLE

I am in the _____ time zone.
(Specify)

NAME_____ ADDRESS_____

_____

DEBE-4194 OT

GENERAL FORMAT FOR TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

I Orientation

What is your position in the accountability process?

What generated your interest in REACT topics?

II Effects on you/others of CAP conferences/publications

How did REACT conference and/or CAP materials affect your approach to accountability?

Philosophy?

Direction of effort?

Other?

Specify outcomes from the above

How transmissable is/was the influence of CAP and REACT to others?

III Unmet accountability needs

What are your unmet accountability needs?

How might they be met?

What other kinds of accountability materials would you like to see?

IV Should CAP materials remain in print?